

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 93 04:30:16 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #335
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 15 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 335

Today's Topics:

 Codeless Technician
 Neighborhood watch groups
 No Frills License Application (4 msgs)
 Restrictions on antenna hght

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 15 Sep 93 01:23:10 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes...

>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com
> (kevin.jessup) writes:
>
>>CW is a form of modulation (just barely) as is AM, NFM, WFM, SSB
>>or any of the digital modes. Yet in order to gain HF priviledges,
>>the CW form of modulation is given weight over all the others.

>Whether the weight given to Morse skill is
>commensurate with the privileges conferred is, or should be, the
>proper subject of this debate.

I thought that's what I was talking about in the whole blessed post!

>>(I would be in favor of more detailed theory on the actual electronics
>>involved, rather than the on-off keying of the electronics!)
>
>What has the electronic theory to do with the question of the
>relevance of Morse skill?

While morse is used by a few, the use of electronic equipment
is common to ALL radio amateurs. Yet, CW appears to be the
yardstick by which the ARRL and the FCC judge the HF radio amateur.

>>Why should I have to know about the actual SEQUENCE of on/off
>>transitions?? Where else in amateur radio is knowledge of the
>>actual encoding sequence (rather than the modulation used to CARRY
>>that encoding) required? CW is NOT hardware. It is a sequence of
>>switch closures used to enable the carrier.

>
>Well, you are required to "encode" your voice identification using
>the English (language) encoding scheme. To use voice modulation,
>you are required to be able to use this encoding scheme. And that
>skill is tested, too, as exams are given in English.

You were REALLY groping in the dark on that one, weren't you!?

>>Please, for the benefit of us ignorant no-coders, answer a few
>>questions and provide evidence for your answers...

>>
>> Does knowledge of CW make one a "better" operator?

>
>Sure. If there are two operators who have otherwise identical
>skills, but one knows Morse and the other doesn't, wouldn't any
>objective evaluation suggest that the one who knows Morse is
>the better operator?

No. The one who knows CW simply operates with the same
on-air and technical skill (or lack thereof) as the other
but uses one additional mode of operation.

>And the *degreee* to which the possession of the Morse skill enhances
>the operator's abilities is hard to pin down.

You can say that again.

Some people may choose to devote their time to other skills.

Why should they have to waste (in their opinion) time on CW?

>> Does knowledge of CW make one more knowledgeable of electronic theory?
>

>No. But this question presupposes that knowledge of electronic theory
>is the sole measure of an amateur's quality.

No it does not. Please don't twist things around. Obviously,
since CW MUST be passed to gain HF access, the ARRL must believe
CW is "the sole measure of an amateur's quality". Other wise,
why the all important "CW: pass it or no HF access" rule?

It is YOU who is requiring greater knowledge of one single
aspect of amateur radio over all others, not me.

Perhaps you should look at ALL the questions under the context
of my first two paragraphs: WHY IS CW WEIGHTED MORE THAN ANY
OTHER ASPECT OF AMATEUR RADIO??

>> Does knowledge of CW somehow prevent one from using profanity over
>> the air?
>

>No. Does knowledge of electronic theory? After all, if you are
>going to hold the Morse requirement up to that yardstick, you have
>to hold *all* of the requirements up to the same measure.

Some participants in the debate (not yourself) have suggested that
CW does just that. As I said, I was asking for evidence.

>> Is knowledge of CW an indication of one's ability to learn
>> the real-world practical aspects of operating an amateur
>> radio station?
>

>Sure, inasmuch as the real-world practical aspects of operating an
>amateur radio station can include, in part, the skill of reading
>Morse code.

Note your words: "can include" (my emphasis is on "can") and "in part".
That is true ONLY if one chooses to operate CW. Again, how
is knowledge of the on-off sequence used to "modulate" a
carrier important for a ham who wants to operate SSB, AM, FM,
PACKET, AMTOR or any other mode, so long as (s)he operates
within a band (including HF) assigned to that mode?

>If you are suggesting that Morse skill testing should
>be eliminated because not everyone uses it, you must also eliminate
>all mode-specific material. So, *don't* put any questions about
>SSB excitation techniques on *my* test, 'cause I hate SSB!

The MODE is the on-off keying of a carrier. End of story.
The SEQUENCE of the on-off keying is entirely independent
of the modulation! If all CW character sequences were changed
tomorrow, NO electronic hardware would have to change.

For the 20th time, ALL modes of operation should have
the same weighting on the test!! Why is CW so God-awful important
in the 1990s?? While the commercial RF world is leaving us in the
dust, we continue to have a CW requirement for phone privileges
below HF. Can we please join the 1990s here?

>
>> OR...
>>
>>Does greater knowledge of electronic theory and hands-on use of
>>equipment, experimentation, antenna and equipment construction,
>>along with on-the-air experience result in a better radio
>>amateur?
>
>Sure. Greater knowledge of *all* aspects of Amateur Radio,
>*including Morse*, is to be encouraged. That's not to say that
>all amateurs need to be skilled in all aspects of Amateur Radio.

However, they MUST be skilled in CW if they want to operate
HF (regardless of what mode they want to use). Right?

BTW, you are NOT "encouraging" Morse, you are requiring it (below
30 Mhz, even for those who wish to operate a mode other than CW).

>>I have yet to see from any of the CW requirement proponents solid
>>evidence (a scientific study by the FCC, the ARRL or any other
>>reputable institution) that knowledge of CW somehow results in a
>>better radio amateur.

>I've seen no study that shows that technical knowledge is beneficial
>either.

Your joking, right? I refuse to even argue this one!

>>Isn't your reason for the continued requirement of CW the old "I
>>did it, therefore everyone else should!" argument?
>
>There are other reasons for arguing for the continued requirement
>for Morse skills. Personally, I feel the privileges attained with
>the skill are out of proportion to the utility of the skill. But
>that's a long way from saying the skill is useless.

Where did I say it was useless?

For the last time, I said that it was given more importance
(based on the test formats) than any other aspect of amateur
radio and that such a requirement is not in-line with real-world
1990s technology.

And finally, quoting you for a second time...

>Whether the weight given to Morse skill is
>commensurate with the privileges conferred is, or should be, the
>proper subject of this debate.

Just what did you think I was talking about?

--

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
give to the government, not the reverse!

Date: 14 Sep 93 15:03:13 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!wupost!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo2!
mcduffie@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:

>>
>> However....the real reliable range of those sets (vhf or uhf) is quite
>> limited, unless thru a repeater, and very few repeater groups will want a
>> nite after nite net on for the duration of time such watch groups would need.
>> So be ready for that. ok?

>Or...establish your OWN repeater.

> --Robert

Yeah! Then the crooks will have a central place to gather information!

Gary

Date: 13 Sep 1993 23:23:15 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!news@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>>Why not just have them fill out an FCC Form 505?

>> --Robert

myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM writes:

>Isn't Form 505 no longer used?

> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ

And besides, Form 505 doesn't point at Part 97.

Jim, W5GYJ

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 93 01:01:19 CDT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>

> > robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>

> >>Why not just have them fill out an FCC Form 505?

>

> >> --Robert

>

> myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM writes:
>
> >Isn't Form 505 no longer used?
>
> > * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ
>
> And besides, Form 505 doesn't point at Part 97.
>
> Jim, W5GYJ

But your proposal points to Part 95, Jim. Ten Four?

--Robert

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 93 00:21:06 CDT
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

> In article PFVq0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
> >
> >Why not just have them fill out an FCC Form 505?
> >
> > --Robert
>
> Isn't Form 505 no longer used?
You can rectify that situation by sending a Petition for Rulemaking.

> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *
I hesitate to tell you what THIS Extra supports.

--Robert

Date: 13 Sep 93 13:49:28 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <1993Sep11.213510.7965@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>You know, the scary thing is, if the whining, snivelling

>#define NASAL_WHINE ON

>Why do I have to do the code??!?!?!?! Its out daaaaaaaated.....

>#define NASAL_WHINE OFF

Besides advancing the CW state-of-the-art, I see
Deignan is still programming in C! ;-))))

What a "cutting-edge" individual you are, sir!

--

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
give to the government, not the reverse!

Date: 14 Sep 93 20:03:23 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!news.nd.edu!bsu-cs!bsu-ucs.uucp!
00hmhammer@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Restrictions on antenna hght
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Delaware County in Indiana has a restriction (Countywide) limiting
antenna height to 75 feet, unless the builder seeks a license.

What is the current law on this type of restriction?

What are the steps suggested by conventional wisdom in challenging
this type of restriction?

Any experience out there?

Howard Hammer
00hmhammer@bsu.edu

Date: 14 Sep 93 14:22:50 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!nntp.msstate.edu!olivea!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <a05L0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <XmRN0B1w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>,

<1993Sep10.183109.22498@genroco.com>~p
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

In <1993Sep10.183109.22498@genroco.com> don@genroco.com (Don Woelz) writes:

>>ehare is absolutely right. Just because someone likes CW, doesn't mean
>>they're an old fart.

>>

>>Conversely, just because some people like CW is no reason to make it a legal
>>requirement for advancement of license privileges. Nor should people who
>>do not wish to operate CW be insulted for their choice.

>>

>>Respect is a 2 way street.

>I have refrained from entering the fray on CW vs. no CW as a
>licensing requirement, but the above argument touched me as being
>absolutely silly. By this argument, if the only mode I am
>interested in is CW, then I should not be required to have any
>questions on my exam about radiotelephone communications, or packet
>operation, or any other mode!!!

>The licensing process is meant to test a potential licensee on all
>aspects of amateur radio. CW is an aspect of amateur radio. Live
>with it.

CW is a form of modulation (just barely) as is AM, NFM, WFM, SSB
or any of the digital modes. Yet in order to gain HF privileges,
the CW form of modulation is given weight over all the others. You
can FLUNK any ONE of the written subject areas of any test, so long as
you EXCEL at all the others, and still get your license. BUT NOT WITH
CW. You MUST pass CW or you CANNOT get on HF. Therefore, CW IS
weighted higher than ANY other aspect of amateur radio.

Do you dispute that?

In reality, about all you should need to know about the actual
MODULATION involved is that the carrier is simply switched on and off.
(I would be in favor of more detailed theory on the actual electronics
involved, rather than the on-off keying of the electronics!)

Why should I have to know about the actual SEQUENCE of on/off
transitions?? Where else in amateur radio is knowledge of the
actual encoding sequence (rather than the modulation used to CARRY
that encoding) required? CW is NOT hardware. It is a sequence of
switch closures used to enable the carrier.

My question to you, sir, is why this should continue to be a
requirement? And for the sake of an intelligent debate, please
leave archaic international law out of this.

Please, for the benefit of us ignorant no-coders, answer a few questions and provide evidence for your answers...

Does knowledge of CW make one a "better" operator?

Does knowledge of CW make one more knowledgeable of electronic theory?

Does knowledge of CW somehow prevent one from using profanity over the air?

Is knowledge of CW an indication of one's ability to learn more advanced electronic theory as related to RF?

Is knowledge of CW an indication of one's ability to learn the real-world practical aspects of operating an amateur radio station?

OR...

Does greater knowledge of electronic theory and hands-on use of equipment, experimentation, antenna and equipment construction, along with on-the-air experience result in a better radio amateur?

I have yet to see from any of the CW requirement proponents solid evidence (a scientific study by the FCC, the ARRL or any other reputable institution) that knowledge of CW somehow results in a better radio amateur.

Isn't your reason for the continued requirement of CW the old "I did it, therefore everyone else should!" argument?

--

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
give to the government, not the reverse!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #335
